

From: n.cornelius@bradford.ac.uk
Subject: Personnel Review - Decision on Manuscript ID PR-02-2015-0029.R1
Date: November 11, 2015 at 3:13 PM
To: kalfes@escpeurope.eu, a.shantz@ieseg.fr, R.Alahakone@kingston.ac.uk

11-Nov-2015

Dear Dr. Alfes,

On the recommendation of Associate Editor, Eddy Ng, I am pleased to advise you that your manuscript entitled "Testing additive versus interactive effects of person-organization fit and organizational trust on engagement and performance" in its current form for publication in Personnel Review. The comments of the reviewer(s) who reviewed your manuscript are included at the foot of this letter.

By publishing in this journal, your work will benefit from Emerald EarlyCite. This is a pre-publication service which allows your paper to be published online earlier, and so read by users and, potentially, cited earlier. Please note, EarlyCite is not a proofing service.

Please go to your Author Centre at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/prev> (Manuscripts with Decisions for the submitting author or Manuscripts I have co-authored for all listed co-authors) to complete the copyright assignment form. We cannot publish your paper without this. All authors are requested to complete the form and to input their full contact details. If any of the contact information is incorrect you can update it by clicking on your name at the top right of the screen. Please note that this must be done prior to you submitting your copyright form.

If you would like more information about Emerald's copyright policy please visit the Information & Forms section in the Resources section of your Author Centre.

Thank you for your contribution. On behalf of the Editors of Personnel Review, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Yours sincerely
Prof. Nelarine Cornelius
Editor, Personnel Review
n.cornelius@bradford.ac.uk

Reviewer(s)' and Associate Editor Comments to Author:

Associate Editor
Comments to the Author:
Dear Kerstin:

Thank you for submitting your revised paper, "Multiplicative effect of person organization fit and trust on engagement and performance" to Personnel Review for further consideration.

I sent your revised paper back to the original reviewers for a second opinion. Both reviewers are satisfied with the revisions you have undertaken and recommend acceptance. In rereading your paper, I very much concur that the paper is significantly improved. I thought that the interactive model you presented has the potential to add to the literature on employee engagement through better P-O Fit and organizational trust.

I am delighted to recommend your paper for publication and look forward to seeing your paper in print. I encourage you to disseminate your paper widely among your colleagues as it has important implications for theory and practice. Congratulations!

Sincerely,

Eddy Ng
Associate Editor
Personnel Review

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Accept

Comments:
The authors have addressed all my concerns and therefore, I feel that this paper should be accepted for publication.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: This paper is interesting and overall makes a useful contribution to the extant engagement literature.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: The authors have cited the relevant literature to support their arguments.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: The methodology adopted for this paper is appropriate.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: This aspect of the paper has been improved. The results are clearly presented and tied to conclusions.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: This section is fairly good.

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: In general, the paper is well structured and clearly written.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Accept

Comments:

Dear authors,

I am very pleased by your improvements to the paper. You added further important aspects to the paper as well as literature in terms of trust. The practical implication section provides some nice insights. I also liked to see that you did more than I asked for in terms of consistent changes through the whole paper. Therefore, I am looking forward to see the paper published.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Due to the new structure of the introduction etc. I am now really happy with the presented originality of the paper.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: This is now given from my point of view.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: I can see from the additional provided measurements e.g. SEM - that the authors do not hesitate to take any effort to prove their results. Very appreciated.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Ok

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: The additional section on practical implications is now provided.

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Well structured and precisely written.